

# The Republican.

---

No. 11, Vol. 9.] LONDON, Friday, March 12, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

---

TO THE REVEREND ROBERT HINDMARSH,  
PRIEST OF THE SECT OF SWEDENBORGIANS,  
OFFICIATING AT THE NEW JERUSALEM  
TEMPLE, SALFORD, MANCHESTER.

---

## LETTER SECOND.

*THE IGNORANT, THE DELUDED, OR THE DISHONEST, HAVE  
ALONE SAID—THERE IS A GOD. My motto against your motto  
of Psalm xiv. 1.*

Dorchester Gaol, March 2, 1824  
of the fictitious Jesus, 68 of the  
real Swedenborg, and the finale  
of both.

SIR,

THAT every God has been an idol created by man is now as correct an axiom as ever was uttered or exhibited. That religion, or a worship of idols, is purely a thing of human invention, without any necessity, utility, or good foundation, is, by me and many others, most clearly seen. That it is in no wise connected with the morals and welfare of mankind is now fully displayed. And that the utter extinction of all notions about Gods, Spirits, and Religion, will greatly improve the condition of the human race, is my most firm, most sincere, and most solemn conviction. To Christianity I am an Infidel: to Theism personified I am an Atheist: to Spirituality of any kind I am opposed, under the absence of all other knowledge, than, that, beyond the animal world, all is insensate, non-intellectual matter: which distinguishes me, in opposition to you, as a Materialist.

In surveying the history and the monuments of past ages, I mark distinctly, that the most splendid eras of human greatness, of greatness founded upon wealth, morals, dignity of mind, and extent of knowledge, to which I may add,

---

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

solid happiness and absence of misery, were those eras in which religion was the least known; when there was no pretensions to the properties, the cause, the effect, of any thing but that which was immediately communicable to the senses. Such were the eras when Rome, Athens, Thebes, Palmyra, Babylon and Ninevah most flourished. And a modern proof of the elevation of the human character in the absence of religion has been exhibited in what was done by Frenchmen, during the progress of their revolution; by a people, who, before and even since, have been comparatively contemptible among the people of Europe. As far as Religion was diminished in France, so far were the dignity, the moral power, and the welfare of the people advanced: and the reason that they were arrested in the progress of their noble career was, when efforts were made too successfully to restore them to religion and monarchy. I will maintain the position against all opposition, that all the improvements in arts, sciences, and the condition of the people in Europe, within the last four centuries, have advanced in a ratio with the diminution of the influence of Priests and Religion, and that the former will go on increasing only as the latter can be diminished.

Under this consideration, I feel, that I am the instrument of much good, in standing forward to avow Infidelity, Atheism, Materialism; for, however humble my effort, or insignificant my personal influence, I am the first man in this Island, I may add the whole earth, who has *openly* defied the religious world upon this ground, that there is no such a God as the advocates of religion preach. Were I not certain, that my conduct will generate nothing but good; were I not certain, that mankind are only improveable as they may be divested of religion, were I not certain, that the whole of religion, is a wicked fraud upon mankind, and that it has no good moral influence; I certainly would not expose myself to pains and penalties, in the endeavour to correct their notions, when a little hypocrisy would set me free and fill my purse. But I am certain, that I am doing an unmixed good, by rooting out an unmixed evil; this cheers me in my dungeon, and is my only stimulant to perseverance. My profit, as far as gain of property is in view, has long lain with a little hypocrisy and dishonesty; but, I appeal to my enemies to say, whether, I have ever cast one lingering look towards it. I appeal to my enemies to say, whether, any one of them has found encouragement enough to dare to recommend any thing of the kind to me. It has

been said, constantly said, that nothing but religion is calculated to support the mind of man under any great trial. Have I, or have I not, found any treatment worthy of being called a trial? If I have, then something better than religion has supported me under it; for, my bosom is thoroughly swept clean of that pollution.

The foregoing is a necessary introduction to my intended refutation of a pamphlet you have published, in answer to my letter to you in No. 20, Vol. VIII, of this work. Though you have assumed a very high tone, I feel the task of refutation to be easy; and so much am I pleased with your answer, contemptuous as it is in many parts, that having challenged you to the combat, I shall proceed to print and reply to every section of it. Having brought you before the public with a real opponent, which you have never before found, I feel no disposition but to treat you with the most perfect courtesy, and to discuss the subject of dispute between you and me with no other consideration than that of its utility among those who are influenced by your doctrines.

Your pamphlet is divided into twenty two sections, which I shall copy separately, and observe upon each as I proceed. First, the title and introduction.

CHRISTIANITY AGAINST DEISM, MATERIALISM, AND  
ATHEISM, OCCASIONED BY A LETTER ADDRESSED TO  
THE AUTHOR BY RICHARD CARLILE.

---

The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.

Psalm xiv. 1.

BY ROBERT HINDMARSH.

---

INTRODUCTION.

A LETTER having most unexpectedly been addressed to me by Mr. Richard Carlile, in a periodical work, entitled, "*The Republican*," for November 21, 1823, in which a direct attack is made upon the Sacred Scriptures, and the Theological writings of Emanuel Swedenborg; and the author of that letter having publicly and vain-gloriously challenged every believer in the Bible, and (to use his own words) "every living Swedenborgian," to a defence of any part or particle of Christianity, upon any one of its bearings;—for some time I found no disposition to take the slightest notice of a production so truly contemptible, as the letter in question. At the same time I was perfectly satisfied, that an unprejudiced and intelligent reader would immediately detect the sophistry and weakness of the argu-



ments adduced, the malevolence of the spirit that dictated them, and the absolute folly, if not insanity, of the deluded writer. But having been repeatedly urged, by many sincere friends to the cause of divine revelation, to step forward in its defence, against the gross calumnies of one, who seems desirous of being considered as the modern champion of Infidelity; and believing that the remarks I have to make on the contents of his letter may prove serviceable, not to him, or to others like him, who I fear are too much confirmed in their own views to profit by them, but to the simple-minded and unwary, who may be in danger of being misled by artful reasonings, and bold but unfounded assertions;—I have at length, though with great reluctance, consented so far to comply with their request, as to point out some of the absurdities and gross errors, which so evidently characterise the wild rhapsodies of Mr. Carlile, and indeed the whole system of Infidelity, Materialism, and Atheism. And this I am led to do, not from any desire to wound the feelings of an individual, but purely from a conscientious regard to the dictates of truth, which can never be overturned either by the open assaults of its professed enemies, or by the wily insinuations of its pretended friends.

My intention, therefore, is not to enter at large upon the refutation of the various arguments, which have been urged by various writers against the truth of the Christian religion; for this would occupy more time and space, than can be conveniently devoted to the subject: but I shall chiefly confine myself to an examination of the most prominent sentiments contained in Mr. Carlile's late publication, and leave the reader to form his own judgment on the merits of the question between Infidels and believers, between men who are disposed to grovel in the mere dust of nature, and those who are willing to elevate their minds to the contemplation of things heavenly and divine.

You have commenced with no small degree of vituperation: your introduction designates my letter to be *vain-glorious, contemptible, sophistical, weak, malevolent, foolish, insane, deluded, calumnious, artful, absurd, erroneous, rhapsodical* and *wily*. This, at any rate, is not setting me an example of modesty. And, in the midst of it, you confess, that "he, and others like him, are too much confirmed in their own views to profit" by your remarks! I have no such an opinion of your followers, Mr. Hindmarsh; I feel confident, that I shall be able to instil a little knowledge into some of them. I cannot fear that you and your congregation are so confirmed in your doctrines about spirits as not to be taught better.

You confess, that you have no hope but with the *simple-minded and unwary*; now, I have hope with the strongest minds about you. If by *simple minded* you mean the *ignorant*, then, I think you confess your weakness; if you mean such as are sincerely open to receive the truth, then also, your fears betray a bad cause. I am not afraid of any reasonings you can address to me, or to the most simple-minded of those who associate with me in opinion.



Speaking generally, there can be but two kinds of people—the wise and the ignorant; and all those matters which we discuss have their foundation, either in knowledge or in ignorance. Your doctrine of spirits is the result of knowledge, or of ignorance. If of knowledge, what need have you to fear about losing the simple-minded and unwary? If of ignorance, how can you honestly desire to keep such people ignorant? If you look seriously at all matters of discussion, at every thing that concerns mankind, you see, that they are subjects which shew the contending parties to differ in the amount of their knowledge, or to be wholly ignorant of the real merits of the matter discussed. The only thing proper and necessary in the matter is, to encourage the most free discussion; and so to communicate knowledge to each other, until we have no alternative but to agree. If you can shew an atom of proof for the reality of the doctrines which you preach, you cannot fail to convince all who hear you, or who read your writings; but, if, on the other hand, you have no such proofs, you may be assured, that a questioning of your doctrines will arise; and nothing can answer that questioning but a demonstration of the existence of spirits. You pay your cause but a poor compliment, when you express a fear that you cannot hold the simple-minded and unwary, should they read my attack upon your doctrine. I should blush for mine, if I feared to let the most ignorant of my friends read your pamphlet. No, you shall see me invite them to read it cheaply.

You conclude your introduction with a notice of infidels, *who are disposed to grovel in the mere dust of nature*, and believers *who are willing to elevate their minds to the contemplation of things heavenly and divine*. Many parts of your pamphlet shew you to be as ignorant of those principles upon which an infidelity towards your doctrines is founded, as I am confessedly of the reality of those doctrines. By the word *nature*, the infidel embraces the universe; and you cannot elevate yourself higher: so when you speak of the *dust of nature*, you use an unintelligible term, and one not fit to be addressed to the *simple-minded and unwary*. You cannot contemplate more than the infidel does; nor elevate yourself higher. It is upon a knowledge of the planets and planetary motions, as far as the telescope can aid his vision, that he rejects your doctrine of spirits, heaven, divinity, &c. Seeing millions of globes of solid matter, resembling that which he inhabits, he concludes, that all space is full of them, and all subject to the same laws and motions. It is

because he cannot discern a variance in their qualities, that he rejects your dogmas. If you can so elevate your mind, as to point out which of them is to form your heaven; then you will have some ground to proceed with your doctrine of spirits; but, if you cannot do this, may not we, who endeavour to look at the matter honestly, fairly, and scientifically, question those doctrines which are opposed to the knowledge of the age, and which originated with certain ignorance, have been carried on delusively, and, in many instances, for the mere profit attached to them? I take your second section.

#### CARLILE'S DENIAL OF THE EXISTENCE OF A SOUL.

II. MR. CARLILE commences his observations by avowing himself to be a *Materialist*, a believer in the infinity and eternity of matter, at the same time holding up to ridicule what he seems to have no conception of, the existence of things spiritual. "Materiality, (says he,) infinite and eternal, against Spirituality, for whatever stakes you will deposit?" That is, matter against mind, body against soul, words against thoughts, gestures against affections, death against life! But he forgets to say who is to be the umpire, or by what authority the wager is to be decided. Of course it is to be referred to himself, or to some of his own creed—the worshippers of gas!! He then proceeds to comment on a pamphlet written by the Rev. John Clowes, of Manchester, entitled, "*On the Two Worlds, the Visible, and the Invisible*;" and after quoting a passage from it, which states, that "man evidently consists of two parts, a body and a soul," one being visible, and the other invisible, adds, "I say, that man is one simple material substance; that he has *no soul* separate from his life; that nothing further is evident; and that beyond this there is no just pretence to make an assertion, or to hint a probability." He further asserts, in various parts of his letter, that souls, or spiritual substances, if any thing, are nothing more than *gas*, *vapour*, or *air*; that when the science of chemistry is known, "all idea of souls and spirits must vanish;" and that "the notion of immortal spirits is altogether a delusion." He then, among other queries, asks, "What is the soul or spirit? say, ye Spiritualists! say, Mr. Hindmarsh, in what do you distinguish spirit? Describe it; exhibit it; or cease to use a *word*, for which you have no *thing* as a relative." To this question I will now endeavour to give an answer, and such a one as I trust will prove intelligible to the plainest capacity.

In this section, we have a proof of what I stated in my last paragraph, that you are ignorant of what Materialism means. You state it, as *matter against mind, body against soul, words against thoughts, gestures against affections, death against life*. Now, taking the word *soul* to be the same as *mind*, Materialism, instead of being contrasted with *mind, soul, thoughts, affections, and life*, embraces and defines them all.—When you jeer us with *worshipping gas*! we proudly answer, that we do not worship any thing; for, we hold man to be the highest known order of intellectual

beings; therefore, he can worship nothing intellectually superior to himself. We do, you do not, renounce all idolatry. This brings me to your third section.

### THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MATTER AND SPIRIT, OR BODY AND SOUL.

III. In the first place, then, it may be observed in general, that as the body of a man is an organized form, but material, created for the reception of a soul or spirit, so the soul is an organized form, but spiritual and substantial, created for the reception of life from the Deity; and this life from the Deity consists in love and wisdom, good and truth, with all their activities in union. Life is one and the same in every created thing, but appears to be varied, according to the variation of form in the recipient subject, whether spiritual or natural, which modifies and adapts the life to its own state and condition of existence. Now as the soul or spirit of a man, together with its influent life, may be regarded as one, because both act as one in and upon his body, and because both are invisible to the natural eye, therefore, in speaking of the human soul, as distinguished from the body, it is to be understood, that the life, of which it is the recipient form, is at the same time frequently included in the expression. With these general observations, I proceed to consider more particularly the true nature and quality of the human soul or spirit.

Every intelligent person will, on due reflection, perceive, that the soul or spirit of a man consists in *will* and *understanding*; the *will* as the seat and receptacle of *love*, with all the affections belonging to it, and the *understanding* as the seat and receptacle of *wisdom* or *truth*, with all the perceptions and thoughts in like manner belonging to it. There is nothing in or about the soul or spirit of a man, but what may be referred to one or the other of these two powers or faculties, or to both of them in conjunction. And these two powers are in themselves spiritual, and altogether different from the material substances of the body, though, by the laws of correspondency, they are in close and intimate union with them. It follows, therefore, that the soul or spirit of a man, inasmuch as it is a *receptacle* of life, must in its nature be something *substantial*; that it is present in every part of the body, transmitting the life received from the Deity into the body, or, in other words, *animating* it; that it is itself in a human form; and that, properly speaking, it is no other than *the real man himself*, who will survive the death of the body, or the separation of spiritual substances from those which are material.

If it be asked, What is a *spiritual* substance? to this question it may be replied by asking, What is a *natural* substance? It is just as easy to answer the one question, as the other. After all the inquiries of the most subtle reasoners concerning the *basis of matter*, independent of its various properties and qualities, it has only been discovered, that it is something solid, hard, and impenetrable in its minutest particles; that it is inert, passive, and without the power of moving itself; yet liable to be acted upon, put into motion, and animated; that it is divisible, occupying space, and extended therein; also that it is possessed of form, is an object of the senses, and adapted to the present natural state of existence. Beyond this, what does any human being know of the intrinsic, fundamental character of a material substance? Nothing at all. Yet trivial and imperfect as this knowledge confessedly is, it is quite sufficient for every useful purpose, in the investigation and contemplation of the wonderful works of



the natural creation. The fact is, *it exists*, and no man in his senses can deny it. So with regard to *spiritual substance*, it would be equally difficult to explain, to the satisfaction of every curious inquirer, what is the *basis of spirit*, independent of its various properties and qualities, only that it is something substantial, capable of spiritual resistance, spiritual re-action, and spiritual extension, (\*) but not of natural extension; that it is possessed of form, and is an object of the spiritual senses, but not of the natural; that it is fitted for the reception of love, wisdom, and life from the Deity, and in all respects adapted to a spiritual state of being. Beyond this, perhaps it is impossible for man to discover what is the true nature of the *basis of spirit*, as contradistinguished from that of *matter*. But with respect to the properties, qualities, and attributes of spiritual substance, these are as certain and determinate as those of natural substance are. And if these latter may be clearly and distinctly pointed out, so may the former with equal facility be seen and described.

Many of the properties belonging to matter or to the natural substances of man's body, are in no respect applicable to his will and understanding, nor to his affections and thoughts, nor consequently to his soul or spirit. The properties here alluded to, as belonging to material substances, whether they be solids, fluids, or gases, evidently bear some relation to space and time: but those peculiar to the human mind are of a totally different character. For example; it may be said of any material substance, that it is either great or small, long or short, wide or narrow, high or low, angular or globular, hot or cold, wet or dry, rough or smooth, and so on: but none of these terms can with propriety be applied, in their usual acceptation, either to the affections and delights of man's will, or to the thoughts and perceptions of his understanding. We cannot measure the degree or extent of affection and understanding either by the carpenter's rule or by the bucket, by the foot or by the gallon, as all the solids, fluids, and gases in nature may be measured. The reason of which is, because all things belonging to the will and understanding in man, considered in themselves, are in a sphere of life and existence *above* matter, and must be estimated by a process altogether different from that which prevails in the admeasurement of natural substances. It is true, indeed, that the natural terms above-mentioned are frequently applied to spiritual or immaterial subjects, as when it is said, that such a person is a man of *great* understanding, or of a *narrow* mind, or of a *lofty* spirit, &c. &c.: but in all these cases the words are to be taken not strictly according to their natural import, but by correspondency or analogy according to their spiritual signification. Thus *greatness*, when applied to the soul or spirit of a man, does not convey the idea either of *length*, or *breadth*, or *bulk*, in respect to natural space, but solely of *excellence* as to character and quality; it being well known, that certain qualities of the human mind are as superior to others, in point of real dignity and excellence, as some material objects exceed others in magnitude or size. The soul of a corpulent man, although it may fill a body which occupies much more space than that of another who is less, yet is not on that account a whit the *greater*. Neither in cases of amputation of limbs, when the body evidently suffers in its dimensions, is the soul on that account a whit the *less*, although the space it occupies is considerably diminished; which is a plain proof, that

(\*) By *spiritual extension* is meant the growth or increase of intelligence and wisdom: for, as the mind improves in knowledge, it is said to *extend* itself, not *locally*, but *spiritually* or *intellectually*, so as to embrace and comprehend a greater variety of subjects.

*extension* in relation to space is not predicable of the soul in the body, but *impletion* only. How absurd would it be to suppose that with every alteration in the bulk of the body, occasioned by disorders or otherwise, a similar change takes place in the dimensions of the soul? And yet this must be the case, if spirits and angels bear any such relation to space, as material bodies do. So also, when mention is made of heaven, that it is *on high*, and of the Supreme Being, that he is the *Most High*, the expressions are not to be understood in reference to *space*, or to any heights of the natural atmosphere, but to those *interior* and *inmost* principles of life, by and from which man is supported in this his exterior and consequently inferior state of being.

Again, the light proper to the body or to nature is one thing; and the light proper to the soul, spirit, or mind of man, is altogether another. By spiritual light, which is truth, man discerns things spiritual or intellectual, and is enabled to examine, compare, and form a judgment upon civil, moral, and religious subjects; together with the relation they bear to each other, and the benefits arising from them to society. But by natural light, which proceeds from the sun, he can only discern natural objects, or such as present themselves before the sight of his natural eye: and even these he can have no perception of whatever, without the presence and aid of spiritual light, which gives him the capacity of beholding the external world through the instrumentality of the bodily eye, and its various configurations, according to the proximity or distance of the objects seen. Hence it is, that a living man, or one in whom the eye of the mind, and the eye of the body act together as one joint power, is capable of perceiving natural objects; while a dead man, or rather a corpse from which the spirit is withdrawn, is utterly incapable of seeing or perceiving any thing in nature, however perfect the organization or structure of the eye may be.

A telescope is an instrument or medium of vision, whereby distant objects, like some of the heavenly bodies otherwise invisible, are distinctly seen by the human eye. And again a microscope is an instrument or medium of vision, whereby objects, too minute to be discerned by the naked eye, are distinctly perceived. Yet no one will pretend to say, that the faculty of seeing is actually inherent in those instruments; but every one will readily admit, that it belongs to the person who uses either the one or the other. So in like manner the natural body is an instrument, medium, or organized form, by or through which the objects in nature, otherwise invisible, are distinctly seen by the human spirit. And therefore no one ought to presume, that man's faculty of seeing in reality belongs to the bodily eye; but every intelligent person will, in agreement with the truth, conclude, that it properly and strictly belongs to the spirit, which makes use of it as its instrument or organ of natural vision. In both cases the principal and the instrumental are distinct from each other: yet when the principal, which exists in a higher or more exterior order of life, would extend its perception to a lower or more exterior state, it assumes to itself such a medium or instrument from this latter, as is best adapted to accomplish its design; and in such case the superior and the inferior, the principal and the instrumental, the observer and the telescope, the spirit and the body, act as one, or jointly together, in producing the effect. But who, besides an idiot, would ascribe to the instrumental medium and not to the principal agent, to matter and not to mind, to the mere body and not to the spirit, the distinguished prerogative of sight and intelligence? Who, besides the mere *groveller in nature*, the worm that feeds upon dust and garbage, would ever think of such an absurdity as this? Richard Carlile, he that boasts of his superior wisdom, and treats with contempt the great

body of Christians, who venerate a Supreme Being, and can discern in all the works of creation the most manifest proofs of benevolence, wisdom, and omnipotence, in perfect union,—Richard Carlile has proclaimed himself to be that man! “*Materiality*, infinite and eternal, against *Spirituality*, for whatever stakes you will deposit!” Such is the language—the presumption—the infatuation of an Atheist, or, if he must have a God, of a worshipper either of himself or of Nature!

This is one of the sections on which I hope to shew you the difference between spiritual dogmas and material analysis. You begin by saying, “that, as the body of man is an organized form, but material, created for the reception of a soul or spirit, so the soul is an organized form, but spiritual and substantial, created for the reception of life from the Deity; and this life from the Deity consists in love and wisdom, good and truth, with all their activities in union.” What call you this, elevated reasoning or stupid grovelling? You say, because the body is organized to receive the soul, the soul must also be organized to receive life. Where is the inference? What the proof? If we speak more correctly, and say the body is organized into a living being, we have no need of your soul, as a receptacle of life. I never found a theologian to distinguish between soul and life before; and, if the soul and life can enter and quit the organized body, is not the inference good, by analogy, that your life may quit your organized soul? I must also beg you to explain both the distinction and the difference, between the words *substantial* and *material*. I have no knowledge but that they are synonymous. Can you further tell me, at what time this organized soul enters this organized body; because, so curious is the structure of the human body, that to fill it with an *organized substance*, which you describe the soul to be, does not seem so easy and rational to me, as putting my foot into a shoe, leg into a stocking, or head into a night-cap. I can fully understand how a pipe, or a series of organized pipes, can be filled with a fluid; but, I cannot understand how the small pipes of the body, the almost invisible fibres, can be made to receive an organized substance. Another thing, I know, is, that nothing but matter, fixed matter, can be organized: therefore, in your rejoinder, if you venture upon one, the first point you have to clear up is, an intelligible definition of an organized soul: and be sure to have it intelligible to yourself, before you commit it to the hands of the printer.

Another point to be cleared up is, how life is received from the Deity. I know well what is meant by life; but I do not



know what is meant by *Deity*; therefore, as you pronounce me an Atheist, you cannot expect me to allow you to assume the use of such a word as *Deity*, without some explanation, some description of what it is, where it is, or what you mean by it. You cannot impart real conviction, you cannot have a sincere and honest proselyte, until you can exhibit something as the sign of every word you use. If you and I continue to disagree, it will be because you are not honest enough to bring your arguments and reasonings to this touchstone. Words are the moral signs of physical substances; and unless your words are such signs, they are worthless. What is the sign of the word *Deity*?

Life, again, you say, consists in *love and wisdom, good and truth, with all their activities in union*. It will be a full refutation of your theory to ask, if there be no life utterly void of love or wisdom, good or truth?

Another theory! "Life is one and the same in every created thing, but appears to be varied, according to the variation of form in the recipient subject, whether spiritual or natural, which modifies and adapts the life to its own state and condition of existence." Here you refute your former theory, unless you distinguish two kinds of life; for, though you distinguish between life from the Deity or spiritual life, and life as a general term, you offer no specimens to lead the *simple minded* and *unwary* to a similar distinction: nor can I see more than one kind of animal life in existence; a vast majority, ninety-nine hundredths of which is utterly void of love or wisdom, good or truth, in a general sense, or in relation to the whole animated world.

Life, in an abstracted or simple sense, is nothing more than organized motion, or a motion of fluids through an organization: and instead of coming from any person or thing, it is the result of the organization, and not any distinct substance, or any thing separable, as you state. Destroy the organization, you destroy the life. Obstruct its course of motion, you destroy the life. If life were what you state it to be, it would resist the suffocation of water, or the strangulation of the rope. What is hanging, but an obstructed motion of the fluids through the organization? You compress the pipes of the neck, so as to choke the passage of the necessary fluids. What is drowning, but a stopping the course of the fluids, by filling the body with water, and shutting out the necessary air for respiration? If you restore a half-hanged, or half drowned person, you do nothing more than restore a circulation of the fluids in and throughout the or-

ganization of the body. Stop the passage of air through the mouth and nostrils, you stop the channel of life instantly; and though life returns, if the passage be rendered free before some of the other fluids have ceased to circulate, still you have a proof, that life is nothing more than an aggregate circulation of fluids through the body's organization.

Taking life in the sense of mind or intellect, it is nothing more than an accumulated recollection of sensations. In my letter of November last, I clearly traced mind to sensation. In your fourth section, you have raised up a position against mine; but you have shuffled aside every argument of mine upon that subject.

Proceeding, you tell us, that soul, spirit, and life, are three words convertible in their use to the same meaning; to this I can have no objection, as a matter of verbiage; for, I find the Bible terms of soul, spirit, life, and mind, to be synonymous, and each successively used instead of the other. The Bible does not offer either difference or distinction in the definitions of these words: and so far, the argument to be deduced is favourable to me rather than to you. You proceed to consider more particularly the true nature and quality of the human soul or spirit—and I to as particular a refutation of your consideration.

You say: "Every intelligent person will, on due reflection, perceive, that the soul or spirit of a man consists in will and understanding; the will as the seat and receptacle of love, with all the affections belonging to it, and the understanding as the seat and receptacle of wisdom or truth, with all the perceptions and thoughts in like manner belonging to it. There is nothing in or about the soul or spirit of a man, but what may be referred to one or the other of these two powers or faculties, or to both of them in conjunction." You might have omitted *will*, and have said so much for *understanding* alone; and then your expression would have been vague. I must again refer you to my former letter, for a shewing how the understanding, that is, ideas, or mind, grows out of sensations; and that, what you here call spiritual power, is evidently a result of the body's organization and of nothing else. At the conclusion of the paragraph under consideration, you divide soul or spirit from life, and make the former a receptacle for the latter. This is confusion; for, you have previously admitted, that the words express one and the same thing; therefore, you cannot exhibit them as one and as two distinct things at the same time. To say, that they are the same and different, is the same as if you said—"I know nothing about either."

You find two bodies, where I find but one: you call the soul a body, inhabiting another body, which I call man. You say, the soul is "*the real man himself, who will survive the death of the body.*" You call the body man, and the soul, the real man. If you understand your own meaning, you can state your case in a manner more clear than this; for, from such a statement, I am not ashamed to say, that I can learn nothing. Your vision seems to me to be a *seeing double*, as we say of a drunken-man. I see a body, a man: I see it move, that is, I see it living: I see it cease to move, that is, I see it dead. Now, what makes the difference? You say another body, or the living body, has gone out and left the dead man. How could it go? How happens it, that it never goes until the body receives injury that destroys its further progress as a machine? And how happens it, that life or motion in the body can be suspended and restored? How does your substantial soul-doctrine tally with these certainties? What becomes of the soul in a fainting fit? What in cases of epilepsy? What when the body is actually dead? At what time does it enter the body? What are its capacities in an idiot? What in a person blind, deaf, and dumb? Where or what was it in the sailor, who lay thirteen months insensible, from the fracture of his skull, and from the undue pressure of a small piece of the bone upon the brain; and who recovered every pre-existing faculty by the removal of that small piece of bone? What or where is it in a fit of delirium? And do you allow, that your soul is a thing to be educated, to be humanly improved? These are questions that imperatively demand a solution from you, who profess so clearly to see a double man, where I can see but one. I see body, I feel mind, by mental perception; but I can trace that mind to be a quality growing out of the body; and, beyond the manner in which I can pour it out upon paper in opposing your doctrines, I can see by analogy, by the precedents of other human beings who have gone before me, that my mind must die as a part of the body. All I can do is to record its existence, its knowledge. The sheet-anchor of your doctrine about souls substantial and immortal is that strong desire which all mankind feel to possess perpetual life. I have that desire; but my knowledge assures me that it cannot be gratified; therefore, I am content; and since I know my time to be short, I will make my career as useful to others and as happy to myself as I can. Here is no delusion: if there be, expose it. Your doctrine of immortal souls is a delusion, and all your ideas



upon the subject—confusion. You see nothing clearly and satisfactorily relating to it; and if you feel comfort in the notion, it is similar to the comfort which drunkenness or insanity imparts—a dream, a shadow, an illusion, a perversion of sensation. You cannot take a friend by the hand and say: “*to a certainty we shall meet in a future life.*” The assertion would be a lie; for there is no such certainty. All our discussions will not alter the facts of the case; therefore, we ought not to be superstitious or bigoted to any opinions; but calmly and honestly investigate the foundations of all. All the burnings, the torturings, the imprisonments, the breaking up of families, the destruction of property, the puttings to death, have not brought heaven a step nearer to our view, nor have they added one argument for the utility of religious doctrines. All has been sheer wickedness, and the result of ignorant malice. With the increase of knowledge, our minds become divested of the foolish and unfounded speculations about religion. We throw them off one after another, and lament the waste of time, the distractions, which they have occasioned.

In the next paragraph of this section, you put the question: “What is a spiritual substance?” To this you should have given an answer, and not have evaded the question by asking “What is a natural substance?” In the sense in which the word *nature* is commonly used, it must embrace your notions of spirit; for, I understand it to mean *the nature or quality of the aggregate of things or existences*; therefore, if your spiritual substance does exist, it must be a part of nature, or a natural substance. We have no such circumscribed views of the word *nature* as you attribute to us. We make it, in our ideas, to encircle your skies, your heaven, and your world of spirits; so that you may see, we can soar quite as high as you, the followers of Emanuel Swedenborg; though we do not travel with so much superstition about us. We travel into the regions of space for accurate knowledge, and not to set up idols. We move from planet to planet for information, and not to enquire “*if this be our heaven? is our God here? can you tell us where we shall find Emanuel Swedenborg?*” When we go aloft, we leave every thing human on the earth, where it belongs, and whence a God cannot remove it. Nature extends beyond the planet we inhabit; therefore, we grovel upon a very large domain; and leave you Swedenborgians much below us in the compass of mind. I repeat it, you are unnatural

grovellers; not grovellers out of nature; for out of nature, you cannot move your spirits.

You assert the existence of matter, and say, *it is something solid, hard, and impenetrable*. If so, how does your soul or spirit penetrate it? You know as little about matter as you do about spirit. There is no such a known existence as *impenetrable matter*; and, if you will pay attention to this fact, you will begin to assimilate matter to your notions of spirits. I do not undertake to say what matter is in the abstract; because, we can only describe by comparison and relation, and I know of nothing with which matter can be compared. I perceive varieties in its composition, and these I can so far compare the one with the other as to say, there is fluid matter, and a fixed or solid matter which is not fluid. I find, that certain processes will fix or render solid, matter that is fluid; and I find, that certain other processes will render fluid, every kind of matter that is fixed or solid; so that I cannot find impenetrable matter; and beyond this, I positively know nothing of matter. I suppose it to be the great whole; because I can find no conceptions of its absence. I cannot conceive its absence possible, from my knowledge of its fluid and expanding powers. I have a very clear conception how the fluids move in and throughout the pores and organization of fixed or solid matter, and I have also a very clear conception how solid matter can move by its greater gravity or force in that which is fluid; but of any doctrine about God, Soul, or Spirit, separate from this definition of matter, I have no conception, nor can I find any one who can describe and demonstrate any thing of the kind.

The doctrine of spirits originated before the relations of fluid and fixed matter were known. The fluid matter was the definition of spirit, and that only which was solid passed under the denomination of matter. But a new era has arisen in knowledge, and an analysis of the properties of matter has enabled us to explode the doctrine of spirits, and to account for a universe with matter alone, fixed and fluid: fixed matter forms the planets, and fluid matter all the spaces between them; so you may now go in search of your skies, your heaven, and your world of spirits. When you arrive at the knowledge that your spirits are nothing more than fluid matter, then we shall agree; and you cannot honestly dissent without exhibiting some proofs to the contrary. It is you who are bound to prove what you preach—not I to disprove it. I know nothing of soul or spirit, separate from

mind, which I trace to be material; therefore, if you know more, it must be easy for you to explain yourself, even to make the simple-minded and unwary to understand; even to make the grovellers in nature to understand. If I could converse with you, I would soon convince you of the necessity of having a sign, a thing, as a reference for every word. It is thus, I put all the parsons to flight who venture to come near me.

You describe spirit *to be something substantial, capable of spiritual resistance, spiritual re-action, and spiritual extension*. You acknowledge, in a note, that, by spiritual extension is meant the growth or increase of intelligence and wisdom. This is what I should define mental extension to be, and so far we differ only in words; but, I confess, that I have no ideas of spiritual resistance, or spiritual re-action: and I wish you had defined each of these terms by a note. It is an axiom, that mankind cannot differ widely about the quality of things, and that the whole of the mischief arising from their differences, is in the use of words not understood by the one as offered by the other. If I could converse with you, so as to ask for explanations as often as you offered an unintelligible or doubtful word, we should soon become of the same sentiment; and such would be the case with all mankind, if they would but observe this rule.

You say also, that matter is *possessed of form, and is an object of the senses*. To this it may be answered, that it is only so with fixed or solid matter. And it is here that I overthrow you, upon the principle of identity—there is no identity but in fixed and solid matter; from which it follows, that there is no immortal identity. This, of itself, is a complete defence of Materialism, and an overthrow of your doctrine of identical spirits. Another insuperable argument against you is, that intellect is a result of animal organization, and that man knows none superior to himself.

To the commencement of your next paragraph, I have nothing to object. Certainly, we cannot measure the mind by an instrument; but we can judge most correctly of its quantity and quality by mental process. In one part of your pamphlet, you tell us, that a soul is in the human form: in the paragraph under consideration, you ridicule the idea, that if a man was to have a limb amputated, a limb of the soul must be amputated also. There is something amusing, as well as confused, in your doctrine here. You say a soul is a human form; by which we are led to suppose, that it forms a part of the whole of the human body.



Now, if a leg of the body be amputated, where can the soul dispose of its leg? You seem quite alive to this objection, and surmount it with a quibble, which can satisfy none but a Swedenborgian. Your own observations upon this point overthrow every other argument you can raise. It is thus a bad cause exposes and defeats itself.

In the next paragraph, you attempt to distinguish between a light proper to the body, and a light proper to the soul. Spiritual light, or soul light, you say, is truth—but what is truth? Truth is no fixed thing, nothing definite, it changes with the increase of knowledge, and may be defined as the highest order of existing knowledge. Thus your *soul light* is a phantom. When you talk of knowledge, intellect, or mental process, the simple-minded and unwary may understand you; but when you personify the word *spirit*, you neither understand what you mean by the term, nor can you communicate a particle of truth upon the subject to any other person. *Spiritual light* is a figure—mankind are only to be instructed by an exposition of facts—things demonstrable. Here again you see double, and your vision will continue diseased until you trace the origin of mind to the first sensation. The last sentence of your paragraph is a proof of this; for, when sensation has ceased, you tell us the body is utterly incapable of seeing or perceiving any thing in nature, however perfect the organization or structure of the eye may be. The fact is, that the eye is but a lens subservient to the organization of the nerves; and when action has ceased in the nerves, the lens, or eye, is of no use to the body. This you, in some measure, acknowledge in the next or last paragraph of this section; but what I call nervous action, you will have to be a personified spirit. How can I deal with you in the settling of this matter; but in asking for proofs of the personification or identity of your spirit? I see mind to be a quality of the body, arising from its sensations; I see it wholly subservient to the state of the body; I see it extinguished with the life of the body; but what do I see in it of personification or separate existence? Nothing. If you see more, grasp and exhibit it. If not, cease to misrepresent it. Cease to impose by figures, which are nothing more than the phantoms of your creation, of a diseased imagination.

I proceed to your fourth section.

#### THE TRUE ORIGIN OF IDEAS.

IV. But here it may be proper to explain more particularly the origin  
No. 11, Vol. IX.

and growth of human ideas, which belong not to the body, but to the spirit or soul within the body. And this is the more necessary, because it *appears* to an indifferent observer, that they are derived solely from those impressions, which are made on the senses by surrounding objects in nature. The Materialist is also confirmed in this view of the subject by considering, that, when man is first introduced into the world, he is utterly destitute of all ideas whatever, and that they *seem* to be communicated to him from without; thus that they originate in matter, and in fact are nothing else but modifications and rarefactions of matter, in the forms of vapour or gas.

It is well known, that man is born in utter ignorance, destitute of all thought and ideas, there being nothing connate in him, but the *faculty* of acquiring science, intelligence, and wisdom, together with an *inclination* to love not only such things, but also himself, his neighbour, and God. This being the constitution of man at his birth, he is utterly incapable of forming an idea without the aid of his external senses, which are the inlets of all impressions from without, and the means whereby his internal connate *faculties* may come into actual exercise. When the image of an object reaches his eye, or a sound strikes upon his ear, the impression made affects the organ in such a manner as to produce a change of its state, and a variation of its form; and this is called a *sensation*, because it is felt or perceived by the soul or spirit, which animates the body. The thoughts, perceptions, and affections, then produced or formed, did not exist as such in the outward objects of nature, and therefore could not have passed from them into man under any thing like mental forms. It is the soul or spirit within the body, and united to it, that instantly perceives, or is sensible of, a change of state, and variation of form, in the natural substance of the organ, whenever an impression is made upon it, whether it be by the vibrations of light in the eye, or by the undulations of air in the ear, or by the application of any matter or thing to the other senses of the body. The impressions made upon the outward senses rest in their respective organs, and do not penetrate beyond them: but the soul with all its faculties, being intimately present in every part of the body, is sensible of those impressions, perceives by their means the state and quality of things exterior to itself, and thus continually enlarges the sphere of its science, intelligence, and wisdom.

The true order of influx, or of the progress of science, intelligence, and wisdom, may be further seen from the following observations. The light of the sun flows into the eye, but not into the internal mind: yet the understanding meets that natural light, and, being as it were clothed with it, is thereby enabled to see the objects of the natural world, which it could not otherwise do. For what is natural or material cannot flow into, much less produce as its proper offspring, any thing spiritual; nor can material ideas flow into such as are immaterial or purely intellectual; science cannot flow into reason, nor speech into thought; neither can the external flow into or produce the internal: for this would be like the crasser flowing into the purer, the posterior into the prior, and the effect into the cause; all of which are as impossible, as it is for "a camel to pass through the eye of a needle," Matt. xix. 24. It appears indeed, on many occasions, as if that were the true order of influx; but it is a mere fallacy of the senses. All influx, on the contrary, is from the spiritual into the natural world, from mind to matter, from the soul to the body; consequently all intelligence flows according to the same order; for it is a great truth, that "a man can receive nothing, except it be given him *from heaven*," John iii. 27. But the fewer or more imperfect the vessels for reception, or the sciences, are,

which a person may have acquired, so much the more obscure and faint is his intelligence, or his perception of genuine truth. Hence the new-born infant, having no science or knowledge as a vessel for the actual reception of reason, has of course neither reason nor intelligence, but only the faculty or capacity of acquiring vessels for a future reception. As he grows up, he acquires science or knowledge by the use of his senses, and from the instruction of his teachers, every day furnishing him with an additional stock, into which, as into their proper vessels, reason, intelligence, and wisdom, continually flow from the spiritual world. But all this while the principle of intelligence is the same in its origin: it only waits for the formation of vessels, into which it may flow; and when that is effected, light immediately descends from heaven, and man becomes a rational, intelligent being.

However plausible, then, may be the appearance, that man derives his ideas from external objects, the real truth is, that he derives no ideas whatever from them, as from a *cause*; which is plain from this further consideration, that every cause is, in point of dignity and essence, superior to its effect; whereas external objects are inferior, in the order of their existence, to the ideas, which are improperly called their effect. But it being equally true, as before observed, that without external objects we can have no ideas at all, it follows, that though not to be regarded as the *cause* of ideas, they are yet the necessary *occasion* of them, serving as *mediums* not only to produce them, but also to embody and render them permanent in the mind. A carriage or a ship is a *medium* of conveyance from one place to another, but it is not the *cause* of motion; and no one, but a child, can be so simple as to imagine that it is. So again the twenty-six letters in the alphabet, when combined and arranged in a certain order and series, become the *medium* of exciting ideas and thoughts in the human mind: but who, besides a mad-man, would ever contend, that such ideas and thoughts are inherent in the letters themselves, or that any combination and arrangement of senseless types and forms can produce what they are altogether unsusceptible of,—wisdom, intelligence, and love? And if they do not possess these mental powers, how can they convey or transmit them through unorganized air or ether into a man, and *cause* him to think, reason, and conclude, upon matters infinitely above their sphere of existence, such as the being of a God, his attributes and perfections, the state of immortality hereafter, and the endless felicities arising from the duties of civil, moral, and religious life? Nay, on such a wild supposition, why might not the brute beasts, as well as man, enjoy the privileges of intelligence and reason? Why might they not institute among themselves societies for the promotion of science and literature, with Richard Carlile at their head, since they are equally capable of seeing objects, hearing sounds, and consequently of imbibing ideas, thoughts, and affections, by means of the senses, if that be the road through which they enter into organized forms? Or why are not all human thoughts and affections, if flowing from the same objects, alike in each individual? And whence is it, that nature, guided by one law, and uniform in its motions, produces such variety of sentiment, such contradictory opinions, as we find among men, if all are operated upon by the same physical cause, and all, by the necessity of their nature, subject to the same results? Let the whole case be viewed in every possible light, by an unprejudiced and intelligent mind, and it will at last be found, that the doctrine of Materialism, or the system that traces the intellectual faculties of man to senseless matter, as to their true source and origin, is a gross error founded on fallacious appearances, and utterly unworthy of being adopted by any man, who possesses a single grain of rationality.



Your statement of the origin of ideas differs only from mine in your personification of the nervous principle; and to support your error, you assert, that *the impressions made upon the outward senses rest in their respective organs, and do not penetrate beyond them*. This is erroneous. There are no outward senses. All sensation is internal, in its relation to the body as a whole. All the organs of sense have a connecting link in and throughout the body; and the slightest sensation vibrates through every nerve. Whether we see, hear, feel, smell, or taste, affection or repugnancy is felt alike throughout the body, according with the force of the object presented to either of the organs of sense. Here again, you may see, that your personified soul is a phantom, and that it is not necessary to account for any thing connected with the human body.

Your doctrine about *influx* is altogether phantasmal and foreign to the question in dispute. Beyond what I have said on the former section, about the passage of fluid through the pores and organizations of fixed matter, I would here observe, in refutation of your doctrine of fluxion, where you say it is impossible for the crasser to flow into the purer; that it is not so impossible, but is a common occurrence. Amalgamation is the common principle of the different degrees of fluid matter; and the crasser flows into the purer with more facility than the purer flows into the crasser; because, there is less opposition, less resistance in the quality. Intelligence does not flow into the mind or body; but is purely a quality generated by the action of that body. It flows out rather than flows in. Your own arguments are interspersed with such truths, as I offer to you, though you do not rest upon them: for instance, you say the child acquires science or knowledge by the use of his senses: true, and all his teachers can do, is, to increase the amount of the action of those senses. But this is a proof of the mind, or what you call soul, being nothing more than the effect of sensation: that it is the excitement of sensation and not influx that communicates knowledge.

When you say, *science cannot flow into reason, nor speech into thought*, you use very confused terms: science and reason, speech and thought, are but convertible terms for the same idea; an acquisition of science is an acquisition of reason: and though speech and thought are distinct properties of the body; yet, the speech of one body flows into the thoughts of another: speech is the communication or sign of thought.

You say further, that it is a *great truth*, that "a man can receive nothing, except it be given him from heaven." I will not be so rude, at present, as to call this a *great lie*; but I will say, it is decidedly and wholly erroneous, even if we allow you your phantom of heaven. It is a Christian phrase, that has neither truth nor sense in it. Upon your other *scripture quotation*, I observe, that a camel could pass through the eye of a needle, if the needle and its eye were made large enough. This may appear trifling; but it is meant to reflect the unmeaning nothingness of your Christian phrase.

In trying to stumble over the question, whether external objects be the cause of ideas, you say: "though not to be regarded as the *cause* of ideas, they are yet the *necessary occasion* of them, serving as *mediums* not only to produce them, but also to embody and render them permanent in the mind." Now, I cannot distinguish between *cause* and *necessary occasion*. You attempt to illustrate by saying: "a carriage or a ship is a *medium* of conveyance from one place to another: but it is not the *cause* of motion." You were not thinking of motions by steam or other mechanical processes at the time, where the instrument of carriage produces its own motion. So with reference to the letters of the alphabet: they are instruments which we can so vary as to make them the signs of our ideas; and the sign refers to the thing signified, of course, and not to any intrinsic quality of its own as an instrument. But all this offers no illustration of your personified soul: it is foreign to your purpose, and a proof of mine at every point.

Again, with respect to the difference between man and other animals: you observe, if external objects produce ideas, every animal would receive an equal amount, or words to this effect. The difference is only this: Every animal has some degree of mind, and man possesses more than any other animal from his capacity so to modify his sounds as to form a more extensive medium of communicating and for acquiring ideas. It has been clearly proved by Mr. Lawrence and other Physiologists, that the difference of organization makes all the difference in character and capacity.

As you state this section to be "on the true origin of ideas," and do not give us one idea how an idea is originated, I will supply that deficiency, and shew you, that it needs not the aid of a personified soul. To give idea its highest value, it is simply a knowledge of the quality of something of which it is the object. Those are but chimerical ideas which rest

upon hypothesis, and which are not descriptive of the real quality of a real thing; such are all your notions about personified souls, skies, heavens, &c. An idea, then, being a conception of the quality of a thing, say any thing you please, it follows, that the thing must have originated the idea, and not the idea the thing. In cases of invention, a piece of machinery for instance, though it seems that the thing is the result of the idea, the fact is not so; for the mind has been considering things similar to the thing invented, and, out of a variety of comparisons and workings of similar things comes a compounded one, more useful in its powers and more simple in its process. A watch had never been invented without the priority of a water-mill, and various wheels constructed for various purposes. A steam engine had never been thought of, but for the observation of the force of steam in vessels used to boil water; and its application to put a wheel in motion had not been made, if the effect of a stream of water for the same purpose had not been previously seen. If knowledge, as you say, be an heavenly influx, explain how it is that all improvement is so slow among mankind: explain, whether your God has known the things of human invention throughout time past, and if he has designedly withheld the discoveries of to day from all former souls. The progressive improvements among mankind, viewed in conjunction with the brute-like ignorance of past ages, form another convincing proof, that there are no such personified souls, no such a personified and intellectual God as you preach. Take the first No. of the Westminster Review and see what a compass of mind, what a volume of knowledge it pours forth, in comparison with any thing of the kind that has gone before it: then ask yourself, why an earlier race of men could not have written in a similar manner. The answer must be, that ideas grow out of accumulated sensations, and a peculiar mode of exciting those sensations. The aboriginal inhabitants of the Islands of the South Sea, of the most perfect organization, had scarcely a second idea on some of the Islands, until the Europeans got among them. The accident which set the machine of mind to work, seems never to have affected them, never to have occurred to them. Read that most important article on public education, in the above mentioned work, and you will discover, that new modes of education are arising which will throw past ages of Europeans at as great a distance in the scale of knowledge, as the New Hollanders are from us. Instead of being an influx from hea-



ven, you will find, that knowledge is a thing of mechanical acquirement, that it is a thing obtained by labour and by labour only. According to your doctrine of heavenly influx, we may suppose a man has only to pray for knowledge to obtain it. Sad delusion! All the prayers that ever were offered, to any, or to every idol, to the throne of grace, or to any other throne, never added an item to the amount of knowledge, never conferred any one benefit upon mankind at large, never were any thing more than a delusion, a waste of time, a perversion of mind from the channel in which knowledge is to be acquired.

To come more particularly to the origin of ideas, I would observe, that they are to be acquired only through the sensations. A month old infant has no idea beyond the knowledge that the pap of its mother will allay its craving stomach. It has no idea of person, or thing, beyond that object. The gastric juices of its little stomach excite it to the action of sucking, and all its evacuations are mechanically, even insensibly, made. A year old infant has acquired sensations or ideas enough to distinguish persons and things, and to become a creature of habit as well as of circumstances. It can walk, speak, do, and forbear to do, at bidding. Now, if you mark the progress and the process of acquiring those ideas, in the infant, you will trace every one of them to sensation; and you will scarcely advance that such an infant possesses a discriminating soul.

Take the case of a man who had never seen a real lion, or the picture of a lion. Bring him before a lion, and tell him the name and the character of that noble beast; he has then an instant idea of what is a lion. Would you say, that this knowledge, or this idea, came to him from heaven? Is it not clear that the object itself communicates the idea, and that without the object, or a description of the object, the idea cannot exist? In looking at the lion, the man would have a sensation of terror from its apparent strength and disposition, a sensation of admiration from its grave and noble visage, a sensation of comparison by referring it to other animals previously known, and distinguishing the difference: and thus would be compounded, his idea, or ideas, of a lion.

Ideas of pity, love, sorrow, joy, wrath, all arise from similar causes, from the impressions made by the different objects of these passions, upon the nerves, or sentient principle. This sentient principle, you call a soul personified, immortal, and with a variety of attributes; but where or how do

you give us one single proof of such a doctrine? We have a distinct knowledge of the nerves and muscles of the body, we have a distinct knowledge of its venous, arterial and fibrous, its osseous and cuticular system; but what do we know about a soul in a human form, that wears the body as its clothing, as we wear a dress? We know nothing about any thing of the kind; because, there is nothing of the kind. We can account for every thing belonging to man without it, and so as to leave no room for any need of it.

Here then, I clearly trace mind to sensation, and sensation to body; and proclaim, that man is body, mortal body, and nothing but mortal body. Mind, is a principle that grows out of and dies with the body; as music grows out of and may be destroyed with its instrument. When you sneer about putting me at the head of a literary association of brute beasts, I can point to mankind, that are nothing superior to, and in some instances inferior to, any brute beast that you can mention. The whole of my efforts tend to raise man from this low condition. I find, that religion brutalizes and stupifies him; and I wish to destroy his religion. I desire to make him socially moral, and morally social; and as to knowledge, I see how much higher he may advance than the highest that exists at present, and I wish to advance him. I see him now in the aggregate nothing above any brute you can mention; but, I wish to raise him above the brute. I would make him in reality what you feign of angels; not by promising him a splendid future life; but by urging him to make the present a splendid and a happy one; not by deluding, and cheating, and robbing him; but by instruction and by urging him to every means of improvement.

I proceed to your fifth section.

#### CARLILE'S MISREPRESENTATION OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES.

V. BUT says Mr. Carlile, p. 622, "If the doctrine of spirits was valid, it would follow, that the human character would need no cultivation: for it may be presumed, at least, that this soul or spirit, which is said to be immortal, and to have existed *from eternity*, must always have possessed the same amount of knowledge!" By whom would such a presumption be hazarded, but by an *ignoramus*, who has never considered the subject on which he speaks, and therefore knows nothing of the rise and progress of science, intelligence, and wisdom in human minds? Besides, who is it that says the soul has existed *from eternity*? Not the Christian who acknowledges a Creator of all things visible and invisible. Why then should he be charged with maintaining a doctrine which his creed expressly renounces? Why should he be wilfully misrepresented, and opinions palmed upon him which he never entertained, unless it be for the purpose of holding him up to

ridicule and contempt on the most groundless pretence ? Yet not only has Mr. Carlile acted in this manner towards Christians in general, but presuming, in consequence of reading a very small portion of the works of Baron Swedenborg, that he has acquired a competent knowledge of his whole system, he falsely asserts of him in particular, that he has forgotten to mention this, that, and the other circumstance, or to explain this, that, and the other difficulty, relative to the state of souls in another life, the universal language proper to spirits, from whatever country of the globe they may have emigrated, and the difference between natural and spiritual substances ; when at the same time the very things, of the want of which he complains, are in other parts of his writings most fully and satisfactorily detailed. These observations are made, merely to apprise the reader of the inapplicability of many of Mr. Carlile's sneers and superficial reasonings, which, having no real foundation to rest upon, are dismissed as unworthy of further notice.

In this section, you impute ignorance to me, for having supposed that souls had existed from eternity, or rather that such was the Christian doctrine. You appeal to your Bible, and, with emphasis, say, it is stated, that there is one almighty creator of *all things*. I rather think, there are Christians, who will wrangle with you upon this point ; though I have but little room to do it. The things created are generally supposed to relate to material, and not to spiritual things : in fact, every *thing* must be a *material thing* ; it is only by courtesy, that the word *thing* is allowed to be associated with the word *spiritual* ; because, you cannot demonstrate aught but material things, and tell us that spiritual, are invisible, incomprehended, things to human senses. I am not offended at any imputation about ignorance of spiritual things ; for, I do confess, that my mind is as ignorant of what the words refer to, as is the goose quill which delineates the confession : and I do sincerely lament, that so much should be said, pertinaciously said, about spiritual things, by spiritually-minded men, without the shadow of a shade of proof, without the pretence to demonstrate the matter as a fact, without communicating any kind of knowledge, without any kind of utility ; but, with accumulating mischief.

You tell me, that, if I had read the whole of the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, I acknowledge that I have not, I should have learnt, that he has explained the difference between natural and spiritual substances. I declare before you and all mankind, Mr. Hindmarsh ; I declare before the spirit of Emanuel Swedenborg and the world of spirits, if there be such a world ; I declare before your God, if there be such a God, that, I am mentally honest ; and that, if you can send me the explanation to which you refer in the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg, or refer me to the volume, chap-



ter, and page, that I may purchase it, I will never after cease to endeavour to emulate you in propagating the same doctrines.

There is this contradiction in your spiritual doctrines: You say, that *the real man is the soul, not the body*; you say, or spiritualists in general, Swedenborgians excepted, I beg pardon, say, that the knowledge of man is the result of his possession of a soul; you, or they, say; for, I expect you will plead yourself to be an exception to the general rule, though you cannot prove it, that spiritual things are above human comprehension: the compendium of which is, *that the soul is the source of knowledge; but, that, it knows nothing of itself, nor of other souls!*

I proceed to your sixth section.

#### CARLILE A MERE GROVELLER IN NATURE.

VI. IN p. 613, Mr. Carlile, addressing himself to the writer of these pages, observes, "I am informed, that among your sect I am called a *mere groveller in nature*; but I will show to you, that Swedenborg, and those who follow him, are less than that, and that they are *unnatural grovellers, beastalized men*; that they are not worthy to rank even with the mass of mankind, depraved, ignorant, and contemptible as they are; that your sect has not the least claim to rationality, and that no one of them can be a rational being."—Bravo! Lissimo! There is nothing like being plain and intelligible. No one can accuse Mr. Carlile of flattery, unless it be his *friend*, who stands at his elbow, and prompts him to high words, and low designs. He must know whom I mean.

Somebody, it appears, has told Mr. Carlile, that the members of the New Church consider him a *mere groveller in nature*; a character, which he has taken some pains to fix on himself. "It is there only (says he, p. 625,) that *I desire to grovel!* and let me remind you, that he, who grovels out of nature, is a *fool* for his pains; and he, who leads others to do it, is a *knave!*" Bravo! again. He cannot get over the word *groveller*: it is the *canker-worm*, that preys upon his mind, and consumes all his candour, if ever he was possessed of any. Without having as yet come into contact with his new enemy, and before a single lance had pierced his body, or a single stone from the brook had sunk into his forehead, he in a manner anticipated the discomfiture, which was to follow his unprovoked attack on the citizens of the New Jerusalem. Knowing from the suggestions of his evil genius, that "he has but a short time" allowed him, this daring "accuser of the brethren" hastens, in great wrath, to "cast out of his mouth water as a flood;" he "makes war" with those who are desirous of "keeping the commandments of God," and of preserving entire "the testimony of Jesus Christ;" he "goes forth to deceive the nations, and to gather them together to battle; he marches on the breadth of the earth and compasses the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city, until at length fire comes down from God out of heaven, and devours him" in a moment. Rev. xx. 8, 9.

The Swedenborgians, as they are called, are pronounced by Mr. Carlile to be *unnatural grovellers*, because they believe in a future state of existence, and, while contemplating the objects around them, raise their minds

from earth to heaven. If this be *grovelling*, it is *grovelling in the skies!* But who, besides a Materialist or Atheist, the position of whose body is absolutely inverted, his head resting on the earth, while his heels point to heaven, could ever think of making such a strange misapplication of language? With him the mole and the worm *soar*, while the eagle and the lark *grovel!* From the attitude, which he has assumed, he regards the dust of the earth as *above* him, and the luminaries of heaven as *below* him! It is this inverted state of the poor man's mind, that has disqualified him for seeing or understanding any thing of spiritual truth; and that which he cannot see, or hear, or smell, or taste, or feel, he believes has no existence. He looks upwards, which with him is *downwards*, in the direction of his feet, and there he can perceive nothing but vapour, exhalation, or gas, which now and then is lighted up for a moment as a *meteor*, an *ignis fatuus*, or a *Will with the wisp!* He then turns his eyes downwards, which with him is *upwards*, in the direction of his head, and there he finds his God or Goddess he had long been in search of, a *palpable* object, the source of all his gases, the origin of all his ideas! To this Supreme Power, in the form and under the name of *Nature*, he pays his willing devotions, and in the exultation of his heart exclaims, "Materiality, infinite and eternal, against spirituality, for whatever stakes you will deposit!"

The whole of this section is such a shuffle and perversion of the question between us, that, fair discussion does not require, that I should condescend to notice it; but to shew you, that I can discuss the matter between us, either humourously or seriously, that I am not to be wounded by satire or irony, by sarcasm or sourness, by trope, trick, or trifling, I will make my friend, the devil, pour his brimstone upon your New Jerusalem, and purge you and your fellow citizens of the fetidness of your spiritually depraved notions. I believe, that I hit your meaning right, in taking that godly personification of yours, the Devil, to be my friend; and I confess, that the high character which Lord Byron has drawn of this one of the Gods, in comparison with his spiritual brethren, has aided my conviction from experience, that *whatever is an object of Christian fear and hatred is a good to mankind.*

Between you and me, it is known, that a friend of mine in Salford, Mr. Joseph Lawton, has been the means of bringing us into a hostile, though a moral contact. It is from Mr. L. that I have received all the information I have of your sect, and he informed me, that whenever he urged any of your congregation to bring about a discussion between you and me, the answer was: "*Carlile is not worth notice—he is a mere groveller in nature.*" Hearing this, I adopted just that stile in addressing you, which I thought would so provoke you and your sect, as to draw you into a discussion. So far, I have succeeded; and, I confess, that, I shall wait with much curious anxiety, to see if you will print a second



pamphlet, as a rejoinder to this reply. I hear, that it is boasted, even from a pulpit, that you have altogether refuted me, as to the contents of my first letter; but, so far from that, you have not refuted one single sentence. You have not shewn me in error at any one point; and, as is usual on the weaker side, you have skipped over every strong point save one. One you have taken, to which I shall come by and by. So far from my having anticipated discomfiture, I assure you, that, as my principles have for their foundation an acquisition of the greatest amount of knowledge, and, as I never will associate myself with any other, under any sect or title whatever, I should hail with joy any discomfiture of my present notions; because, that discomfiture must bring me good, must make me wiser and better. I know not what better proof can be offered of my real object and disposition, than in opening the pages of my publication to such a pamphlet as yours.

Upon the word *grovelling*, I am of opinion that I have already said enough, but will shew you that I do not feel offended at it. You have taken my first observations on this word in a spirit that I did not mean to convey. Knowing well, that all difference of opinion among mankind argues a difference in the amount of the knowledge among them as individuals, and no other difference, I knew, that, you would not call me a groveller, or any other abusive name, if you could have openly refuted the opinions I have broached to mankind. Never would there have been any religious persecution, if the party with power had been superior in knowledge to the party persecuted. It is not in human nature to torture ignorance, because it is ignorant. Brute animals were never questioned about their religious opinions; and, if a persecutor felt, that he could communicate knowledge to one of opposite doctrine; if he felt, that he could shew erroneous notions by fair argument and demonstration, he could no more descend to persecute a man, than to persecute a horse, about matters of opinion. I lay it down as a correct proposition—*that all idolatry is vice—that all religion is idolatry—that man knows nothing of any object of worship other than in ignorance and fear—that in fact, he cannot say he has any knowledge of any thing higher in the scale of intelligence than his species, or, that is a fit object for his worship.* This is the rock of my knowledge: let that man stand forth who can remove its foundation by fair argument. He that cannot answer, let him cease to persecute. Shutting me into a prison, and rob-



bing me of my property, you see, Mr. Hindmarsh, have done nothing more for the Christian Religion, than *to torture me, my family and friends*. In spite of this torture and robbery, I am mentally stronger at this moment, than at any time past: and I am so far a formidable enemy to the Christian Mythology, that no Christian can be found to say, that he will fairly discuss with me the merits of his religion. Your pamphlet is low abuse, in three pages out of four: and in no one page have you fairly opposed me upon the merits of the question at issue.

You say: "The Swedenborgians, as they are called, are pronounced by Mr. Carlile to be unnatural *grovellers*, because they believe in a future state of existence, and, while contemplating the objects around them, raise their minds from earth to heaven. If this be *grovelling*, it is *grovelling in the skies!*" Every thing is unnatural, in relation to our knowledge, that cannot be shewn to be a natural process. Supposing I were to ask you, what do you mean by *heaven*? What do you mean by *skies*? What answer would you give me? Point your finger upwards? That would be no answer; because, in section 19, you state, that such is the orbit of the earth, that upwards becomes successively every point of a circle; or such is the inference of the earth's annual motion round the sun. In speaking of position, distant from the earth, we cannot speak correctly, but in the word *around*. The motions of the earth refute all references to *up* or *down*. Then if heaven and the skies be all *around* the earth—where is hell situated? Come, Sir, you shall *grovel* for *hell*, as well as for *heaven* and the *skies*! A few minutes reflection—and then, you may perhaps discover, that *whether a man have his head or his heels in contact with the earth, in the course of a year, makes not the least difference in relation to his position with what you call heaven and the skies!* There! Sir! See how impudence and conceited ignorance gather their own chastisement! Now, you may *flirt*, *soar*, or *grovel*, where and how you please, whilst I tell you a *grovelling tale*, lately imported from America.

There are Swedenborgians in the United States of America. They are like you, ready to encounter any other sect of Christians. Perhaps, you have read the smart rebuke which Thomas Paine gave Mr. Hargrove the Preacher, when he intruded himself upon the former to say, that they (his sect) had found the key to the scriptures, which had been lost four hundred years. "*It must have been very*

*rusty,"* said Mr. Paine, in his deliberate, sarcastic way! However, lately, two persons, a Swedenborgian and another, were discussing the merits of the New Jerusalem doctrine. You say, said the objector to the Swedenborgian, that we are all to follow the same trades in the next world that we have followed in this? That is certain. And you say, that we are not to die again, after we have died once and risen again? That is impossible. Well then, and what am I to do for a living in the next world, who am a grave digger in this? Can you, Mr. Hindmarsh, satisfy, or has Emanuel Swedenborg satisfied, the grave diggers and undertakers upon this head?

Having flogged you enough, for your *learned* insolence, in this section, I will conclude my observations upon it, by telling you, that the Materialist or Atheist is certain of immortality and perpetual existence, but not in identity. Whilst living, it is known, that we change the matter of our bodies more than six times a year; but always retain enough of former figure to constitute identity of person: the last change which death and decomposition bring, merely destroys identity; because, there is no life to renew the growth. Life is perpetual growth and change or decay: death is dispersion of identity. The abstract of which, as of every other thing, or its relation, that you can mention, is **MATTER IN MOTION**. We neither say, that fixed matter is the source of fluid; nor fluid the source of fixed: we know both to exist, and to be perpetually graduating from the one to the other; and that is all we do know. Know you more? If so, shew that knowledge in something more than hypothetical words and chimerical ideas. Before I get upon my legs again, I will just remark, that, if you dig a hole, put a man's head in it, with his feet erect, what do you see? Scarcely any thing more than a branching vegetable, with the roots in vegetable form downward. Place him upon his legs, and then you see, that the difference between animal and vegetable is, that the former carries its roots in an inverted order from the latter, or in the highest parts of the body. The brain, you may take as the root of the nerves; the heart, as the root of the veins and arteries; the stomach, as the root of the bones, muscles, &c. or as the general root of the body, to which we apply the soil for its nourishment. This may not be physiologically precise; but it is near the mark. "Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest." (To be continued.)



THE following notes accompanied a donation of Five pounds: the first and second were written by the donor, with real name and address; the second, marked "private;" but a friend in London thought it adviseable to suppress the name and make the note public. The third note is written by the donor's friend in London.

**TO MR. CARLILE.**

SIR,

I BEG your acceptance of five pounds, as a testimony of my abhorrence of persecution in every shape; and particularly so, in matters of *opinion*; as to which, no man can have a right to dictate to another; although unfortunately, as far as the happiness of mankind is concerned, those who have the strong hand, forgetting that TRUTH cannot possibly stand in need of any adventitious aid, are far too apt to mistake the *power* for the *right*.

I am, Sir,

Your very humble Servant.

MR. CARLILE,

THE above will be forwarded to you by a friend of mine; and well-wisher of yours, in London. Knowing by experience what persecution is, though what I suffered was very trifling compared with yours, I can the better feel for your situation. I am happy to think that your wife and sister have at length been freed from the fangs of the torturers. But for the grossest injustice, you also would have been free in body, as well as in mind, long ere this; and I sincerely hope the time is not far distant when you will bid adieu to your *worthy clerical friends* in Dorchester: althought I am sure you will never forget their *kindness*. To you it must in some degree, compensate for your sufferings, to be informed that the cause, to which you are a martyr, is daily gaining ground. It must have done so, from the natural progress of light, even without your powerful assistance; but you have forwarded the march of the human mind at least half a century. Wishing you health and happiness, I remain,

Your sincere well-wisher.

P. S. It was I who had the pleasure of forwarding to you in 1822, ten pounds from a most excellent man, and amiable friend, in Paris.



MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

March 7, 1824.

I EMBRACE the opportunity of sending this five pound note from my friend—— with whom I have often talked over your heroic conduct. My Nephew once or twice tried to see you in prison, but though a respectable young farmer in that part of the country, your worthy magistrates denied all access. My name is on your list of annual subscribers of one sovereign, which has been regularly advanced by me, though existing causes compel me to keep it unknown, and on this occasion, strongly recommend you should keep the public in the dark about real name and abode,

## Your Friend,

**NEMO.**

SUBSCRIPTION FOR MR. CARLILE.

By J. W.—From a sincere friend to Civil and

## Religious Liberty (Piccadilly.)

200

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 84, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican" to be left at the place of publication.